

ER 5-5434

May 7, 1954

Hon. Allen Dulles  
Director Central Intelligence Agency  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

Enclosed is the copy of a letter which I this  
date sent Secretary of State Dulles.

If we remain on the defensive in our conflict  
with World Communism all will soon be lost.


The enclosed material contains views and ideas  
personal to myself, but which I think worthy of your  
consideration. I hope that you will be able to find time  
to read this material.

Respectfully,

  
William J. Flittie

WJF-ms

STATOTHR

Mr. William J. Flittie  


DOCUMENT NO. 1  
NO CHANGE IN CLASS ☒  
☐ DECLASSIFIED  
CLASS. ORIGIN: 73 S C  
NEXT REVIEW DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
AUTH: 732  
DATE 3/3/81 REVIEWER: 010370

*BEST COPY*  
*Available*

### THE AMERICAN CHOICE

I am a veteran of World War II. In my time of service I did nothing remarkable. I only served within and without the country as ordered, and when the time came that the war was done, I was happy to remove my uniform and become, once again, a civilian. I was no more than one of the many who made up the millions.

As such I would now speak, and with a terrible urgency within me to speak and be heard, for I fear that that for which we fought, my fellows and I, is in imminent danger of betrayal by the leaders the American nation has set over it. My mind is a conflict of anger, futility and despair, and in it is the bitter realization that that which the American leaders have thus far done, and that which it would seem they intend to do, is not enough. America's puny international program of today is not that for which my fellows and I gave up the many years of our lives, and, in extreme cases, life itself.

Like most Americans I loathed military service. I found it to be the complete antithesis of my upbringing in civilian America. But, discharging my citizen's duty, I served for five years during the late war. And, while I hope that henceforth and forevermore America's young men may serve her with better means than with weapons of death in their hands, I would gladly do as much again at any time we were immediately faced with a war of survival. The democratic ideal, admittedly imperfect among us, but surely better realized in this land than in any other, is more important than my little life or petty ambitions. Behind this America of ours lies too much agony, too much striving, on the part of our forefathers, on the part of my dead comrades in arms, that I

should ever wish to break faith. In the remote possibility of keeping the last feeble glimmer of the American ideal a living thing in this earth, I should count it an honor to participate in the last bitter battle of utter hopelessness against a superior enemy.

How far is the superior enemy from our gates? Not far, I think. What is the superior enemy? Atomic warfare in the hands of ruthless men. The measured, desperate pleas of our scientists, the only men with sufficient understanding of atomic power to know the horror that is created among us, warn us to act, boldly and soon, for the time in which we may do so is short.

The atomic age has burst upon an unready world. By their every word and deed, the leaders of this nation, and of all the nations of the earth, demonstrate themselves incapable of a genius of statesmanship to match the genius of the men who created atomic power. Their only answer thus far, beyond a continued reliance upon armies and navys, today possibly as obsolete as knights in armor, has been the creation of the United Nations Organization, a helpless debating society.

I do not criticize the motives of men who honestly place a reliance in the United Nations Organization, for they are men of peace. But I do criticize the thought process that permits them to rely upon an organization that clearly cannot, save through moral pressure, exercise any control over the great sovereign powers of the earth. And I do violently criticize the structure and powers of the United Nations Organization. I see in it only a cloak behind which potential aggressors may arm for war-nay, are arming for war. I see in it only a stage upon which Machiavellian actors may play-nay, are playing, to disassemble the unsary. I see in it

an organization without power to compel even an academic consideration of vital world issues, and subject to a multitude of legal subterfuges to impede the search for truth and decency. Admirable though its purpose, it is an organization, as presently constituted, that the world would actually be the better without, for by its very presence it beclouds the true perspective of the state of the world. It is, and may increasingly be, the haven of fools and the plaything of tyrants until such time as the forces of evil desire to throw off the cloak and stand before a terrified world in their true light.

There is one thing which is absolutely crystal clear in my mind. Before it all other issues pale to utter insignificance. Until it is solved, there is no foundation upon which men and nations may build their varying lives. SOMEHOW THERE MUST NEVER BE A WAR IN THIS WORLD IN WHICH BOTH SIDES HAVE RECOURSE IN QUANTITY TO THE POWER OF ATOMIC WEAPONS. If this should ever be allowed to occur, civilization as we understand it, will most certainly join the ranks of other forgotten epochs. The very creators of the bomb are trying desperately and unanimously to warn us of the terror they have created. They know, contrary to the opinions of the self-styled "experts" that there is no defense save the defense of a guarantee that at this point in the course of the world's history, wars cease. To emphasize their warnings are the battered, lifeless hulks of two Japanese cities, destroyed in one blinding flash, and now mute and awful testimony to the terror that is loosed and, as yet, uncontrolled among us. And they further warn that those bombs were but puny forerunners of bombs that can be brought into existence, perhaps already are in existence. I do not disbelieve them.

Our leaders have chosen to ignore the warnings of the scientists.

They have done, and seemingly propose to do, nothing to guarantee the peace of the world. I submit that our leaders fail us, that we need new leaders of a stronger, tougher breed who, while pledged to a highly moral concept of good will and decency, will be sufficiently intelligent as not to place an entire reliance upon good will alone in a world where savage brute force and bad faith lurk very much at large. I submit that it is not immoral to demand and enforce, in accordance with our American values, a world in which men can live in peace and decency even though such demands should have to be enforced at the cost of one more war—a war to be fought, if such should prove necessary, while we alone are in possession of that weapon before which all other weapons are as nothing. I prefer the concept of a war of prevention to the prospect of an almost certain war of desperation in the event we do nothing.

Our leaders, admitting the bankruptcy of their program, are now preparing us for life in a world armed against itself, a world where deathly fear will be the constant companion of all people. Our military men now begin to explain to us how even an atomic war can be "won." The people of the nation and of the world, daily despairing more and more, increasingly resign themselves to another war in our time. The people of the nation and of the world are deserving of better than this.

I question the meaning of "victory" in an atomic war, unless the hollow spectacle of a handful of starving, miserable people standing upon the wreck of twentieth century civilization, and plunged into a new dark ages, be victory. Rather, I think the victors would be those fortunate ones who, in the struggle, attained death. I cannot conceive, nor have I any desire to

live a life as devoid of meaning as would be life after an atomic war, for I have experienced the richness and promise of the present, product of many toiling generations. And yet, if once destroyed, modern civilization will not be restored in many times the lifespan of men now living. I submit that we will do well to ponder the implications of this problem with care, for this time we cannot afford or survive one mistake.

I submit that now, if ever, is the time to act. If ever a time was when bold experiment was justified, that time is now. Hitherto men and nations could afford, and history tells us did constantly invest in, the luxury of warfare. Even the latest one cost but a trillion of treasure or tens of millions of lives. In the face of the entire world's wealth and lives, such a cost was still small. The paying of it has not permanently impaired our civilization. The world prior to now has been able to recover. Selfishness, viciousness, and absolute sovereignty have been, prior to now, things for which the world could pay the price.

But no longer. We must have a complete break with the failing precedents of the past, proved in repeated disaster. Granted, anything we do may fail, for no product of man bears the stamp of ultimate perfection. But what we are doing now is almost certain to fail. We are gambling with oblivion, and we have not, as yet, provided ourselves with even a reasonable hope of winning the gamble.

Thus far one great voice has been raised in warning, the voice of Winston Churchill. Unfortunately he is saddled with convictions of empire which we do not, most of us, admire, and he had made the great error of seemingly suggesting that America underwrite Britain's empire. On these points his critics have succeeded admirably in

debunking his entire statement. But Winston Churchill's speech at Fulton, Missouri was the first responsible statement by any great leader of the democratic world concerning the dark future into which we are proceeding. Winston Churchill sees the danger inherent in a world over some parts of which tyranny and terror still rule, and go forth unchecked to do aggression. He has called upon us to face the problem. I suggest that we will do well to face it squarely now. And I further suggest that Winston Churchill's warning is more worthy of credence than are the unconvincing reassurances voiced by the present American administration.

I fear that Churchill's speech will end by being honored as the first trumpet of doom in a world that has not much longer to continue.

How many wars of self-defense, each time at the risk of our whole world, must we have fought before we learn that good will alone is not enough? We don't try to operate our internal society by good will alone, for we know, as a matter of simple common sense, that that would utterly fail. We provide laws, and a police force to enforce those laws, to keep irresponsible and dangerous elements in line. The outlaws are, and will always be, among us. And just as there are outlaws among us, there will be outlaws among nations, capable of wreaking untold harm upon the world, for so long as nations have absolute sovereignty. Curb them we must, very soon, and this time permanently, for we are now facing our last chance. This is the gamble with oblivion.

I do not hesitate to name the outlaw nations. They are Russia, and to a lesser extent only because they inherently pose a lesser threat, Argentina and Spain. Nor am I sorry they can be identified, for now, before a general production of atomic power has done its irreparable harm, we are clearly confronted with the necessity of



ensuring a permanent peace. I pray that we not permit ourselves, now our suspicions are once aroused, to permit them to be lulled by honeyed words from our potential adversaries. The lesson of Adolph Hitler is so close that it would seem we could remember it. We must not stop short of a solution which will guaranteed world peace insofar as it is possible for men to make such a guarantee.

No more do I hesitate to name the essentially democratic states of the world that, through their insistence upon outmoded and ruthless empire, so gravely impair the voice of decency and peace in the world. They are Britain, France, and the Netherlands, though others, including ourselves, are guilty in lesser degree.

Argentina and Spain stand convicted by the declarations of our own government, a government that, strangely enough, refuses to take positive action against them even while acknowledging their terrible guilt in contributing directly and indirectly to the death of American servicemen. The old men who lead us are too much awed by the ancient shibboleth of national sovereignty, it seems. On the one hand we see the guilty leaders of Germany and Japan on trial for their lives, and on the other hand equally guilty men the honored leaders of nations. Somehow their decadent reasoning exonerates any bandit or gangster who can draw about his shoulders the peculiarly charmed and inviolate cloak of an undefeated national sovereignty. In the case of Spain they permit a government, the child of fascism, installed in part by the action of the outlaw nations with whom we lately engaged in a death struggle, and in part by our own criminal negligence in discharging our world obligations, to continue to impress its will upon the unfortunate people of Spain. Like Pontius Pilate they wash their hands after a pious statement decrying the wrong. In what way can this complete repudiation of

intellectual honesty be rationalized? I confess that I do not understand.

Russia, superficially, seems the harder to arraign. She was, until the recent conclusion of hostilities, our active ally in the greatest war of history, a war in which we needed her aid, and she ours, and without which mutual aid it seemed improbable, prior to the discovery of the atom bomb, that any of us could have won the victory essential to our respective ways of life. It has been the earnest prayer of the millions of the world that somehow Russia would identify herself, both by word and deed, with an earnest desire for world peace. Yet arraigned she must be. Russia, by her recent actions, has exposed herself as a danger in the world, and no amount of lip service, now, to the ideals of the United Nations should be allowed to blind us to the realization of that for which Russia actually stands. We will do well to perceive that war makes strange bedfellows.

Lucid reason should have told us that Stalin's Russia is no more to be trusted than Hitler's Germany. Her fault is inherent in her structure. She is a police state, without responsible public opinion, in which the will of the nation is the will of a single man. One can scarcely live in continued safety in a world where such a nation exists, particularly if the nation be a major one soon likely to succeed in arming herself with the weapons of atomic warfare. Even were the good faith of the present Russian dictator to be granted, which can hardly be the case, there is no guarantee that her future leaders will continue to be responsible. The last Napoleon is yet unborn. Probably the world will go on producing these power-crazed madmen up to the day of its end. But is there any reason why we democratic peoples of the world should permit a political situation to exist in any land where the seat

of power for such a man exists ready made and waiting for the would-be conqueror to occupy it? We shall never be able to prevent Napoleons from being born. We can try, however, to deny them all power for all time.

Aside from the danger inherent in Russia's very political system, what is the record of our late ally? It must be candidly admitted by any fairminded individual, I think, that Russia's late actions cannot, even optimistically, be considered those of a nation acting with a sole purpose of furthering peace in the earth. Rather, she behaves as the conqueror preparing for further wars of conquest. Already possessed of one-eighth of the earth's lands, and the certain realization that any reasonable requests she makes will be acceded to, she simply seizes what she desires by unilateral action. Power politics is in full swing in the world of today, and Russia is the chief protagonist of the ugly game. Treaties and obligations are meaningless.

Russia has absorbed the Baltic states contrary to the wishes of those peoples. All of Eastern Europe is occupied, and though the occupation is perhaps justifiable, the utter, ruthless domination of those populations cannot be justified. In Yugoslavia another vicious dictatorship under Russian tutelage takes form. Turkey lives in constant dread of Russian military might. Iran, in violation of express treaty obligations, has had her territorial integrity violated, and though she earlier protested, her now unnatural silence is even more ominous. Manchuria, the territory of our common Chinese ally, is raped, and remains occupied in violation of Russo-Chinese agreement. Other Chinese territory has been wrested from China to form so-called free republics, and treaties have been extorted to legalize the plunder. And over all

territory which Russia occupies, whether by right or wrong, as well as over Russia herself, has descended what Churchill aptly describes as an "iron curtain." What goes on behind this curtain we are not permitted to learn, though what few glances we have been permitted are disconcerting, for Stalin's Russia bears a striking resemblance to Hitler's Germany. From behind the curtain come occasional mouthings of hatred and vituperation against our way of life, alternating with short periods of sweet reasonableness when Russia knows she has pushed matters too far for a nation not as yet armed with atomic weapons. And the regimented janissaries of the unofficially reborn Communist Internationale, once again in obedience to orders from Moscow, cry their paean of hate and non-cooperation in all the lands of the earth with the hope that their baleful influence will speed the coming of chaos and bring the day of revolution. Peace will not live for long in such an atmosphere.

No man can honestly believe that Russia's objectives are proper. On the contrary an examination of the Russian record must fill one with foreboding. The least that one can conclude is that they are the actions of a nation not unwilling to have recourse to warfare to win her ends. And since this time so much is at stake, reasonable men cannot afford to gamble that the record is other than what it seems--the record of an aggressor, the record of a breaker of the peace among nations.

This cannot be meant to be the world for which the men of democracy fought their longest, most terrible war. It reminds too much of the last half of the last decade when naked force strode arrogant and proud through the earth breaking all decency to its iron will. It reminds too much of that which we but a short time

ago went to war to end. In fact, it is the same old poison abroad in the earth once more. Only the names are changed. But this time I pray to Almighty God that we shall not fail. It is not too late yet. It will only be too late when the first aggressor has sufficiently armed himself with the weapons of atomic warfare. We have remaining to us three to five more years, our scientists tell us. Then, if we have failed, it will be too late. The end of our world, as we understand it, will be upon us. Such little future as may remain to us will be at the sufferance of our enemies. Our only hope will be the improbable hope that atomic weapons will somehow not be used.

Abraham Lincoln, in his life, gave voice to two great truths: "A nation divided against itself cannot stand." and "This nation cannot exist half slave and half free." True of the nation in Lincoln's day, it requires no great perception to see that these statements are even more applicable to the entire earth in the present age. For the word "nation", then, I substitute "world", and in the rereading I clearly see the two great ills of my world. The one, absolute national sovereignty, rampant and unchecked; the other that peculiar sense of false superiority latent in all men which permits men and nations to arrogate themselves to be the overlord of their brothers. Both must be relegated to history before there can be world peace.

I would see the United States, then, as her final act of complete national sovereignty, eschew and enforce a program whereby both unchecked national sovereignties and domination of subject peoples be brought to a conclusion. I would see my nation enforce such a program, even to the extent of a war in which she used the weapons of atomic warfare against those who refused to guarantee

the peace of the world. And then I would see America honorably relinquish her power to a world government and subside to the level of a no longer completely sovereign member of a family of nations also no longer completely sovereign.

I am aware that some men say we dare not risk a future in a world where we have not our complete sovereignty. My answer is that we dare not risk a world any longer in which nations are sovereign. That era ended when the first atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima. And since we cannot, in conscience, set out to rule the world, nor consent to rule by another nation, we must agree to rule by the entire world.

Perhaps the one great objection to world government is the objection that if war be forever outlawed, the peoples of the earth will no longer have a means of forcing political change upon their reluctant rulers. It is a valid objection. Only through revolution and force of arms have most important political advancements been achieved. In such a way our own nation was born. But an adequate substitute exists, and has already been used with an encouraging degree of success in Greece. It is the internationally supervised election under the authority of which representatives of world government can supervise free, secret, and democratic elections at stated intervals in all parts of the earth, and between elections could ensure that no coercion or intimidation of a political opposition is tolerated. I would have no fear in a world where the exercise of a free vote was guaranteed. I would have no objection to having my elections supervised by a superior government if I could know that the right to free government was being equally enforced throughout the earth.

This, then, is the bare framework of world government which

I propose: A government in the nature of a court, chosen by the peoples of the earth from among their qualified jurists with due allowance for population, level of civilization, and area in allocating the representation. This court-government would operate by majority decision in terms of specific cases brought before it as do our appellate courts. There should be no legislative, and but a bare minimum of executive power, for these are the types of power which feed on themselves and grow beyond original intendment. Independent and adequate revenues should be drawn directly from the peoples of the earth, and the powers of this court-government should be strictly and exhaustively delimited by a written constitution granted it by the peoples of the earth. And the duties of this body should be only those of interpreting and effectuating that constitution, and of issuing temporary orders pending such determinations.

This constitution should give world government power to

absolutely outlaw all recourse to armed warfare;

hear and make final disposition of all disputes among nations which have a basis in conflicting sovereign rights;

supervise elections throughout the world;

guarantee freedom of speech;

guarantee freedom of religion;

guarantee freedom of information;

guarantee the free passage of private persons throughout the earth;

prevent any intimidation of the peoples of the earth;

decide, in the event of controversy, the measure of a free man eligible to vote in the different nations of the earth on the principle of maximum possible reasonable suffrage;

hear and act upon the petitions of minority groups large enough to merit consideration who desire self-determination or amalgamation with another political unit, that other political unit acquiescing;

Guarantee free physical access to the markets of the earth by the most convenient routes;

Maintain the only armed forces in the earth, themselves to be representatively chosen, and their arsenal to be in the United States solely for reason of the nation's political stability, productive power, and continued devotion to the ways of democracy and freedom, the nations of the earth having been totally disarmed;

have the sole custody of and control over atomic power except as it can be safely turned to peaceful endeavors;

administer those peoples of the earth clearly incapable of self-government until such time as they become politically responsible;

punish as criminals any person or group of persons who transgress the guarantees of the peoples of the earth.

It will be noted there is no suggestion of vesting any economic powers in world government. Not only is economic power of the essence of a nation's separate life, and properly a national function, but were economic considerations to be interjected, there could be no early agreement, and we must have agreement upon a stronger world governing body very soon. Nor is there any proposal that a universal system of government be prescribed. If America wishes to be a capitalist republic, Russia a communist republic, and Britain a socialist monarchy, that is a small matter, and one of national privilege. There must be one qualification however, and that is that all systems must be democratic, granting the governed the opportunity, at set intervals, to retain or change the government by which they are governed. In short, all systems must be democratic for only democracy is safe, and only through democratic government can the legitimate, continuing aspirations of the world's people



be realized.

The world government which I envisage would exist for but two fundamental purposes: To strip away forever the power of nations to wage war, and to free all men and forever guarantee them in their freedom. Only to that extent should the sovereignty of the nations of the world be impaired, and that is all that is necessary to accomplish the great purpose.

I think the leaders of the United States fail to apprehend the readiness of their people to support a truly forceful program having as its objective the permanent outlawing of war. I have talked to Americans in many walks of life, and I find on all sides a desperate awareness of the dangers of this post-war world. I find a readiness to assume the burden of any program which will offer a reasonable possibility of ridding the world of the fear which again pervades it. I suggest that the leaders of the United States are not worthy of the people they govern.

I submit that World War II was another of the many negative wars lately fought by the democratic world for no better purpose than to have won and prepare for another war. I submit that the United Nations Organization, child of the late war, is at present a failure in which no responsible man can place his trust. I submit that we must have an international government which will permanently outlaw war, and soon, for there is little time.

America stands today at the peak of her power. For so long as she alone is possessed of atomic weapons, she is the one great power in the earth. Beside her all others are as nothing. We may fail to comprehend the immensity of our power, but be assured, our enemies do not.

America alone has both the power and the innate decency to sponsor and enforce a program of true collective security among

nations. If America will do it, she will be trusted, and it will succeed.

Let the leaders of America draw a program of world government. Let it be scrupulously fair with no special privilege for this nation or any nation. Let the leaders of America, in earnestness and humbleness, submit the program to the nations of the earth. But also let them make it known that while reasonable modification will be considered, no mutilation which will in the least degree modify the fundamental purpose of the program will be tolerated. Let America thus gather unto herself the true friends of world peace and world freedom, and then let all nations refusing to comply be branded outlaws and served with an ultimatum to comply or face certain destruction. Then, if need be, let there be war. World peace and world freedom should not be made to wait upon the whims of the recalcitrant masters of unfortunate nations.

I have raised my voice. I know it to be a woefully weak voice, but I pray that others, adding to it and making it their own, will make it strong. Strong enough to be heard by the leaders of America. Strong enough to be heard by the nations of the earth. Strong enough to, in its strength, change the present suicidal course of world events.

America stands today the sole hope of the world. Our obligation is crystal clear. The mantle of responsibility falls squarely upon us. Ours alone is the power. Ours alone is the decision. We cannot avoid, nor can we share, the awful burden. The beginning of world peace, or the beginning of the end of modern civilization is the choice we alone must make. The future of the world from this point forward will be an American creation, for at this point in the

world history, succeed or fail, we are, as no other nation  
has ever been, the arbiter of destiny.

WILLIAM J. FLITTIE  
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA LAW SCHOOL  
APRIL, 1946

May 7, 1954

Hon. John Foster Dulles  
Secretary of State  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Dulles:

The conduct of American foreign relations, and the obtaining of necessary supporting military operations to put teeth into it is admittedly very difficult. Too little and too late is the dismal record of our country ever since Theodore Roosevelt's Administration. It seemingly matters not that more die and suffer in the long run, or more important, that we may even lose our freedom one day because of the reluctance to act positively which is thought to be demanded by political considerations. The very short range view is favored, and particularly since the end of World War II has been a ghastly, murderous failure, now promising more death and destruction than the world has thus far seen.

I doubt that you can break this vicious circle. I doubt, too, that the Eisenhower Administration has any real inclination to break it, though now and then you utter words which would seem to indicate some effort to break the complacent attitude of our people. It is because I think that there is a small chance that you do not really believe in buying today's peace at the price of all the tomorrows, forever, that I am writing this letter.

In my opinion there remain but two real chances of avoiding total war, completely destructive to the United States and world civilization.

Hon. John Foster Dulles

-2-

5-7-54

It is nonsense to assume, in the present framework anyway, that the mere existence of hydrogen and atomic weapons in the hands of both potential enemies increases the likelihood of peace. In fact, and ~~wordy~~ window dressing to the contrary, this situation return the advantage to the Communists. Their analysis of American policy is that we will not use these weapons unless compelled to do so by a direct attack on ourselves or possibly some one of the Western European nations. (I might add that I think this analysis correct myself, though I hope that I am wrong.) This leaves them free to continue aggression in terms of their superiority in numbers of men and conventional weapons throughout most of the Eurasian land mass, with early opportunity to soon expand into the rest of the world.

In short, they will nibble us to death until one day we wake up and find we have lost our world by default. Then, perhaps, in a violent revulsion at our own mistake we will use these weapons, but it will be too late. We will have lost the world by attrition or will lose it in holocaust. Either way freedom perishes.

Communism is again pressing hard, this time in Southeast Asia, and so soon after the Korean conflict that we had just as well realize that in terms of objectives we were the losers in Korea.

Both President Eisenhower and yourself have said we must hold Indo-China.

All right, let us hold. And with or without allies, let us end this sham of petty peripheral wars and throw down the gauntlet to China (a nation not as yet in possession of atomic weapons),

Hon. John Foster Dulles

-3-

5-7-54

which they will surely accept, for they are now too far committed to back down. But, instead of fighting another foolish little war in Indo-China, let us promptly expand military action to China proper and proceed to use in full the weapons of massive retaliation until the Chinese Communists cry quarter on our terms. Then the world will have a concrete example of American massive retaliation, and no one will any longer be able to indulge the assumption that we won't use the terrible new weapons. Our foreign policy will have teeth instead of bluster, and perhaps, with such a terrible example before them, the Russian Communists will never start a world war.

I am aware that millions of Chinese will suffer and die if we do this thing. But if we don't do it, it will eventually be even more millions of innocent people, who moreover, are not as yet the enslaved tools of Communism. And millions of these millions will be Americans.

The Chinese people have become the weapons of our implacable enemy, World Communism, even as the Germans and Japanese earlier permitted themselves to become the weapons of Fascism. The United States, to save itself and human freedom, has killed millions of such people in the past for just such reasons. Let us cease our hypocritical squeamishness and false moral standards, which our own history so clearly demonstrates do not, in fact, exist and never did exist, and do what must be done while there is still time.

I am aware, too, that we risk Soviet intervention and world war in making an example of China. I do not, however, believe that the Russian leaders will commit suicide to save or aid China, and neither must President Eisenhower nor yourself, or you would not

Hon. John Foster Dulles

-4-

5-7-54

have made your recent massive retaliation statement and placed it in such clear juxtaposition to the Indo-China problem as you did. Or were you making bigger threats than you are now prepared to make good upon, a common and destructive fault in our foreign policy?

In any case, the present situation and foreseeable world prospects are intolerable. The time is here to take enormous risks provided the risks have hope of success. Otherwise the United States and its way of life will progressively be pushed out of the earth until, backs to the wall we must, to save our honor and avoid slavery, precipitate the war which will destroy civilization.

The other manner in which we might seek permanent peace has no relation to the matter just discussed. Nor is it anything which offers a certain or early hope. Hence, while well to attempt, no positive reliance can be placed upon it.

As is now well-documented, millions of persons in Russia have no love for their Communist masters. This feeling is found in all strata of Russian society, but should be strongest in the long-persecuted peasantry. This means it should also be strong, if latent, in the Russian Army, made up in most part as it is from peasant conscripts. The sons of the Russian peasants must have absorbed a great deal of their parents' hatreds.

If this analysis be in any degree correct, it follows that an Army revolt is possible if an Army leader can be found who will risk revolt, and I think it must be conceded that the only hope of successful revolution in Russia would be an Army revolt. The overthrow of a great modern police state by internal means can only be accomplished by turning its own weapons upon it.

Hon. John Foster Dulles

-5-

5-7-54

There must be highly placed Army men in Russia who toy with the idea of an Army revolt. For one, life under a regime where, if one occupies the highest Army positions, the chances of coming to a natural death have proved less than 50%, is not satisfactory. It is even entirely possible that there may be high officers in the Russian Army who have come to believe that men should be free, with an opportunity to live in decency and honor, and that it is World Communism centered upon Soviet Russia that bars the way whereby the world might progress to such an estate. Or if not a man who believes in freedom, at least a man who believes that a world order should be created which does not, as does the present world order, carry the certain promise of eventual world destruction.

Our strongest efforts, probably through the Central Intelligence Agency headed by your brother, should be directed toward finding such a man and extending him all possible support. This support, for example, could include providing him with a prepared timetable for seizure of the government just prior to his revolt (a comprehensive plan being almost impossible to formulate inside Russia without grave risk of detection), and giving him material guarantees of food and aid whereby he might hope to secure himself in the affections of the Russian people in the early stages of a revolt.

The main qualifications are that he command armed troops (preferably in the Moscow area), that he be intelligent and stable, and that he dare, alone, to suddenly give the order to seize the government, relying upon untested latent popular support for the success of his movement. He would be a lonely, fearful man.



Hon. John Foster Dulles

-6-

5-7-54

I am enclosing the copy of an article which I wrote eight years ago. My purpose in enclosing this article is simply to show that I had better perception of the future than had most people. I do not say this boastfully, for the future is a fearful prospect and I wish I had erred in my then estimate. But I was right then, and millions, including thousands of Americans, have already needlessly suffered and died simply because of our failure to act when we should have acted. If such inaction is a crime, the American majority and its leaders are guilty of a terrible crime against the rest of the people of the world.

The situation has grown far more dangerous than in the recent past, but there yet remains a thinning edge of hope, though this time in terms of courageous gambles instead of the relative certainty of outcome that might have been ours several years ago.

No lucid man with any understanding of human history and human nature can honestly believe that permanent peace can be had in the present world framework. Yet without a permanent peace we are confronted with the certain end of our civilization, and if we leave the initiative with Russia, the terrible new weapons will surely be used by both sides within the lifetime of most men now living. Unless, of course, we mean to surrender without a fight, which is unthinkable regardless of degree of destruction in prospect.

The petty diplomatic victories such as the one you recently won in Berlin are really meaningless. You are now finding this out at Geneva if you didn't know it before. I believe that you diplomats

Hon. John Foster Dulles

-7-

5-7-54

have lost sight of reality and are participating in a ritualistic  
semi-literary game<sup>OF SEMANTICS</sup> which confers upon you rewards and chastisements  
essentially in a vacuum, but nevertheless, to your minds, con-  
stituting a full and complete discharge of your reasons for existence.  
This is wrong. For God's sake act in terms of the real and earthy  
issues which are life or death, freedom or slavery, and act promptly  
for time is all but run out.

Respectfully,

JF-ms

William J. Flittie

STATOTHR

Enclosure

Mr. William J. Flittie  
